

Application N .: 09/767,390

Docket No.:JCLA6877

REMARKS

The Advisory Action has stated that the liquid crystal molecules are not perpendicular to the substrate. It should be noted that, when the working voltage is applied, the liquid crystal molecules will be twisted to the designed direction is different domain. When the voltage is off, the liquid crystal molecules are aligned perpendicularly to the substrate (not shown in FIG. 2).

The Office Action also states that the claims do not define the W-like structure is with respect to the top view. It is believed that the claims has clearly recites the top view relation by "...formed on a surface of the first substrate...". However, Applicants have amend claims to avoid this consideration from the Office Action.

The Office Action also states that the recess of the prior art reference Negae et al. is equivalent to the opening of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully disagree. In the claimed invention, the openings are distributed along a direction from the tip of V-like structures and vertical to a lone edge of the bagutte pixel *with respect to the top view also*. The openings are clearly seen in FIG. 2.

The Office Action states that the recess between protruding structure of Nagae is considered as openings. The Office Action does not specifically point out which recess is considered. Applicants take FIG. 8 as the example, in which the recess is formed due to the

Application No.: 09/767,390

Docket No.: JCLA6877

protruding structure in side view. In other words, the recess and the protruding structure are alternatively change.

Clearly, the recess of Nagae is not like the opening of claimed invention. Nagae also failed to disclose the openings as recited in claimed invention. In FIG. 2 of the present invention, the openings 64 of the present invention, as shown in FIG. 2, are not due to the protruding structure 62.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 7 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-6 and 8 patently define over the prior art references as well.

Application No.: 09/767,390

Docket No.: JCLA6877

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all pending claims 1-8 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/15/2003
Jiawei Huang
Registration No.: 43,330

J.C. Patents
4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax : (949) 660-0809

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 16 2003

OFFICIAL